

It is to be regretted that we have not space to reprint in its entirety an article which appeared in the *Journal A. M. A.*, December 21, 1907, exposing the "hyoscin-morphin-cactin" anesthesia. No other preparation has been so extensively advertised, and, because of the position of the gentleman who is putting it out commercially, the fact that he owns a medical journal himself, and is a most prolific writer and contributor to other journals, no other preparation has had so many "write-ups" in a given period as has this wonderful "new" anesthetic. But the *Journal A. M. A.* shows that it is not "new," it is not wonderful, it is a secret proprietary, it is being exploited in ways which, to say the least, are not above question—and it is *dangerous*; just as dangerous, no more and no less, than the old scopolamin-morphin anesthesia which has been known, used and almost discarded, years ago. Do not be misled by the glib words of the promoters, the Abbott Alkaloidal Company, or that most prolific of writers, Dr. Wm. C. Abbott; the stuff is *DANGEROUS*. How many men do you know who have ever given over five thousand anesthetics? Probably not one; possibly one. One such was consulted upon this point, and he gave it as his opinion that the promiscuous use of hyoscin or scopolamin and morphin with or without "cactin" (which is an unknown "concentration") is *dangerous in the extreme*. He has used scopolamin and morphin in properly selected cases, for ten years or more, and he knows whereof he speaks. Even the manufacturers admit that the use of scopolamin and morphin is dangerous, but they claim that they use hyoscin and that hyoscin and scopolamin are not the same clinically. This statement, made by the interested manufacturer, is directly opposed to the statements of all the experts in the world, and is contradicted by the manufacturers of the chemical themselves. As the *Journal A. M. A.* so aptly points out, the manufacturers of this dangerous combination, who are in every possible way urging the members of our profession to use it indiscriminately, and who are making for it the most utterly extravagant statements, must either be ignorant of generally recognized and well known facts, or they must be ignoring them for their own gain. Will you believe the pharmacopeias of the world, the statements of all chemists who have investigated the subject, and the statements of those who manufacture scopolamin, that hyoscin and scopolamin are identical, or will you believe the statement of the interested manufacturer of the "H-M-C" anesthetic that they are not the same? Every physician who has the slightest regard for his obligations toward his patients and his own responsibilities, should read the article in the *Journal A. M. A.* and should remember that hyoscin, or scopolamin, and morphin is a *DANGEROUS* mixture to use, and that "cactin," is inert, despite the contrary statements of the interested manufacturers.

The materia medica of our homeopathic brethren must have greatly increased since the time of Hahnemann, if one may judge at all from the various remedies which are presented to their attention through the medium of the advertising pages of the homeopathic (?) medical (?) journals that have reached our office. *The Medical Advance*, *The Hahnemannian Monthly*, *The Cleveland Medical and Surgical Reporter*, *The Critique* and the *New England Medical Gazette* are publications of the class indicated, and a casual inspection of their advertising pages is instructive. All of these publications claim to be strictly homeopathic; some of them are strenuously so. Therefore, let us see what they recommend their readers to use: Ferro-nutrine; bovine; hydroleine; sal hepatica; aletris cordial; celerina; pinus canadensis; anti-itis; Hagee's cod liver oil; Fellow's hypophosphites; sanmetto; Gray's glycerine tonic; bromidia; antikamnia (which appear opposite the advertisement of the American Institute of Homeopathy); pepto-mangan; meatox; glycozone; antiphlogistine; glycothymoline; Peacock's bromides; seng; cactina pellets; chionia; Angier's petroleum emulsion; Colden's liquid beef tonic; dioviburnia; neurosine; germaletum; hydrozone; urasol; glyco-heroin and passiflora. These are merely the "curious" things that are advertised; in addition there are "ads" of a number of standard preparations, some of which have been approved by the Council of Pharmacy and Chemistry. Is it any wonder that the Homeopathic (?) medical (?) journals are as strongly opposed to the work of the American Medical Association, through its Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry, as are the medical (?) journals of the regular school? It is just a matter of dollars and cents, when all is said and done; and the nostrum man has the dollars to pay for advertising space, for that is what makes his business.

Your JOURNAL has preached on many occasions the necessity of educating our legislators in the matter of the proper sanitary care of the human animals in our state, and once again we revert to the subject. Recently, a gentleman in the South called attention to the fact that our state expended something like thirty times as much money on the care and protection of its fishes as it did for the care and protection of its children! How truly touching! And most of us believe that children have souls and fish have not; yet the fish are protected in innumerable ways—and the children not at all. Possibly we have taken too literally the injunction "Suffer little children to come unto me," and our lack of care for them and their health or their lives is merely an evidence of obedience and a desire to let the little children go to the Lord as fast as possible! Game wardens are active in pursuit of him who catches the delectable trout out of season; but are ordinary town trustees or health officers as active in the pursuit of the par-

FISH OR CHILDREN?